

University of Maryland at College Park
Department of Curriculum & Instruction

Course Syllabus

EDCI 665 - Clinical Instruction in Reading
Spring 2004

Class Meets: Tuesday 4:15-7:00

Location: Room 3211 Art-Sociology Building

Dr. Rose Marie Codling

Office: Room 2226N Benjamin

Phone: 301-405-8361

Email: rcodling@umd.edu

Office hours: Monday 12:00-1:00

Tuesday - 3:00 to 4:00

Wednesday - 3:00 to 4:00

Or by appointment

Course Overview

The goal of teacher preparation programs at UMCP is to prepare reflective practitioners for a pluralistic society through research-based inquiry. Students preparing to be reading specialists in the Reading Education Master's degree program learn to be reflective, to develop a broad repertoire of teaching skills, to develop relationships with culturally and linguistically diverse students, and to base their teaching practice on sound theory and research.

In keeping with these goals, the purpose of this course is to promote the concept of diagnostic teaching: the type of teaching that is informed by (1) knowledge of teachers, (2) knowledge of educational goals and assessment, (3) knowledge of pedagogy, (4) knowledge of subject matter, and (5) knowledge of curriculum. This course emphasizes current thinking concerning approaches and materials of use to reading specialists in planning programs of individual and small group instruction. A primary focus is on theory-based decision-making and teachers will be guided to inquire into their own practice and encouraged to make teaching decisions based on what they learn.

This course will provide opportunities to study relationships between diagnostic assessment and diagnostic teaching and will stress the importance of using assessment to inform instruction. Throughout the semester, students will be guided in identifying children's literacy needs, literacy strengths, and interests. Additionally, students will become skilled in designing instruction that utilizes learners' strengths to meet their needs. Students will be given opportunities to practice approaches to literacy instruction that have proven helpful for students in need of special help.

COURSE OBJECTIVES: Each objective is followed by the appropriate Standard or Standards developed by the Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International Reading Association.

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to:

demonstrate understanding of

1. relationships between diagnostic assessment and instruction (2.14)
2. motivational, academic, and social issues related to instruction for struggling readers (4.1, 4.4)
3. theory-based and research-based methods, strategies and practices in reading and literacy instruction (1.1, 2.14, 4.3)
4. instructional challenges for ethnically and linguistically diverse learners (1.2, 4.4)
5. importance of reflective teaching practice (3.2)

demonstrate competency in

6. planning and practicing student-centered, integrated literacy activities (4.3)
7. administering informal and formal assessments (4.2)
8. conducting individual diagnostic screenings to identify literacy strengths and needs (10.1, 10.2)
9. report writing based on assessment findings from diagnostic screenings (11.4)
10. demonstrating research-based instructional techniques to colleagues for professional development purposes (11.5, 13.1, 14.1)

Course Grading

Class Participation (15%).

Class participation is an important component of this course. You will learn the content of the course and be better prepared to apply the information if you become actively involved in discussions and interaction with your classmates. You should come to each class prepared to become involved and discuss the assigned readings. Individual and small group in-class activities cannot be made up in the event of absence. Necessary absences should be discussed with the instructor as soon as possible.

Demonstration Lessons (30%).

The demonstration lessons will focus on an instructional strategy. Students will select a strategy, review the available research on the strategy, and plan a presentation. The presentation should be designed as an in-service type workshop to demonstrate for classroom teachers how to use the strategy.

Diagnostic Screenings & Reports (45%).

Students will conduct diagnostic screenings of children who will be attending the Summer Reading Program. The screenings are conducted on selected Saturday mornings from March to May. Various assessments are administered and the findings are reported in a detailed written report that is sent to parents and filed for use by Summer Reading Program teachers.

Final Exam (10%).

- A = Superior work that meets all criteria and shows creativity and special effort
 B = Very good work that meets all criteria and shows effort
 C = Adequate work that meets all criteria
 D = Inadequate work that meets most, but not all, criteria
 F = Inadequate work that fails to meet criteria or failure to submit assignment

Required Text

Almasi, J. F. (2003). Teaching strategic processes in reading. NY: Guilford Press.

Recommended Texts

Barr, R., Blachowicz, C., Katz, C., & Kaufman, B. (2002). Reading diagnosis for teachers: An instructional approach (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Block, C. C., & Pressley, M. (2002). Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices. New York: Guilford Press.

Gambrell, L. B., Morrow, L. M., Neuman, S. B., & Pressley, M. (1999). Best Practices in Literacy Instruction. New York: Guilford Press.

Lipson, M. Y., Cunningham, P. M. & Wixson, K. K. (2002). Assessment and instruction of reading and writing difficulty (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Tierney, Robert J., Readence, John E., & Dishner, Ernest K. (1995). Reading strategies and practices: A Compendium (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Walker, Barbara J. (1996). Diagnostic teaching of reading (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Tentative Schedule

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Readings</u>
Jan 27	Overview of Course – What is <i>remediation</i> ? Discussion of diagnostic screenings and	

	Summer Reading Program (SRP)	
Feb 3	Issues Related to “Remediation” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • terminology • remedial programs • instruction and instructional tasks 	Johnston & Allington (1991)
Feb 10	Meeting the Instructional Needs of Diverse Learners Preparation for Screenings Report Writing	Klenk & Kibby (2000)
Feb 17	Factors that Contribute to Reading Difficulty	Scarborough (1998)
Feb 24	Reading Strategy Instruction Preparation for Screenings Report Writing	Almasi, Chapters 1, 2 & 3
Mar 2 (1998)	Word Identification Instruction	Stahl, Duffy-Hester & Stahl Almasi, Chapter 6
Mar 9	Demonstration Lessons Preparation for Screenings	
Mar 16 (1999)	Vocabulary Instruction	Rupley, Logan & Nichols
Mar 23	Spring Break	
Mar 30	Reading Comprehension Instruction Demonstration Lessons	Almasi, Chapter 4
Apr 6	Reading Comprehension Instruction Demonstration Lessons	Almasi, Chapter 5
Apr 13	Spelling & Writing Instruction	Templeton & Morris (1999)
Apr 20	Content Literacy Instruction	Alvermann (2001)
Apr 27	Instructional Frameworks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language Experience Approach 	Tierney, Units 2 & 5

- Directed Reading Activity
- Directed Reading-Thinking Activity
- Guided Reading

May 4 (1997)	Reading Instructional Programs	Dudley-Marling & Murphy
May 11	Designing Effective Clinical Programs For Struggling Readers	Almasi, Chapter 7
	SRP Update & Expectations Final Exam	

Tentative Screening Schedule

Screening #1

Screening #2

Screening #3

Screening #4 & #5

Screening #6

Please Note:

All students are expected to adhere to the University of Maryland's Code of Academic Integrity, which can be accessed at <http://www.testudo.umd.edu/soc/dishonesty.html>. Failure to adhere to the code may result in the grade of XF – failure due to academic dishonesty.

The University of Maryland Honor Pledge, proposed by the Student Honor Council and approved by the University Senate, reads:

“I pledge on my honor that I have not given or received any unauthorized assistance on this assignment/examination.”

Unless you are specifically advised to the contrary, the Pledge statement should be handwritten and signed on the front cover of all papers, projects, or other academic assignments submitted for evaluation in this course. Students who fail to write and sign the Pledge will be asked to confer with the instructor.

If you have a documented disability and wish to discuss academic accommodations, please see me immediately.

Late assignments will be subject to a grading penalty.

Additional readings may be assigned as the semester progresses.

Required & Recommended Reading List

Afflerbach, P. (1993). STAIR: A system for recording and using what we observe and know about our students. The Reading Teacher, 47, 260-263.

Allington, R., & Walmsley, S. A. (1995). No quick fix. Newark, DE: International Reading Association & NY: Teachers College Press.

Almasi, J. F. (2003). Teaching strategic processes in reading. NY: Guilford Press.

Alvermann, D. E. (2001). Effective literacy instruction for adolescents. Executive summary and paper commissioned by the National Reading Conference. Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Anderson, E. M., & Maehr, M. L. (1994). Motivation and schooling in the middle grades. Review of Educational Research, 64, 287-309.

Au, K. H. (1998). Social constructivism and the school literacy learning of students of diverse backgrounds. Journal of Literacy Research, 30, 297-319.

Block, C. C., & Pressley, M. (2002). Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices. New York: Guilford Press.

Braunger, J., & Lewis, J. (1996). Building a knowledge base in reading (2nd ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Calfee, R. & Hiebert, E. (1991). Classroom assessment of reading. In R. Barr, A. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, and P. D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume II (pp. 281-309). NY: Longman.

Ciardiello, A. V. (1998). Did you ask a good question today? Alternative cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 42, 210-219.

Clark, C. H. (1996). Keys to successful cognitive and affective intervention with challenging students. Reading & Writing Quarterly, 12, 265-290.

Cunningham, P. M., Hall, D. P., & Defee, M. (1998). Nonability-grouped, multilevel instruction: Eight years later. The Reading Teacher, 51, 652-664.

Davey, B. (1989). Assessing comprehension: Selected interactions of task and reader. The Reading Teacher, 42, 694-698.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: the self-determination perspective. Educational Psychologist, *26*, 325-346.

Dudley-Marling, C., & Murphy, S. (1997). A political critique of remedial reading programs: The example of Reading Recovery. The Reading Teacher, *50*, 460-468.

Duffy, G. G., & Hoffman, J. V. (1999). In pursuit of an illusion: The flawed search for a perfect method. The Reading Teacher, *53*, 10-16.

Duffy-Hester, A. M. (1998). Teaching struggling readers in elementary school classrooms: A review of classroom reading programs and principles for instruction. The Reading Teacher, *52*, 480-495.

Fitzgerald, J. (1995). English-as-a-second-language reading instruction in the United States: Research review. Journal of Reading Behavior, *27*, 115-152.

Foorman, B. R., Francis, D. J., Fletcher, J. M., Schatschneider, C., & Mehta, P., (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading failure in at-risk children. Journal of Educational Psychology, *90*, 37-55.

Fox, B. (1990). Teaching reading in the 1990's: The strengthened focus on accountability. Journal of Reading, *34*, 336-340.

Freppon, P. A., & Dahl, D. A. (1998). Balanced instruction: Insights and considerations. Reading Research Quarterly, *33*, 240-251.

Gambrell, L. B., Morrow, L. M., Neuman, S. B., & Pressley, M. (1999). Best Practices in Literacy Instruction. New York: Guilford Press.

Garcia, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1994). Assessment, testing, and instruction: Retrospect and prospect. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Review of education: Volume 20 (pp. 393-419). Washington, DC: AERA.

Gaskins, I. W. (1998). There's more to teaching at-risk and delayed readers than good reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, *51*, 534-547.

Guillaume, A. M. (1998). Learning with text in the primary grades. The Reading Teacher, *51*, 476-486.

Graham, S. (1994). Motivation in African Americans. Review of Educational Research, *64*, 37-54.

Graves, M. F., Van den Broek, P., & Taylor, B. M. (1996). The first R: Every child's right to read. Newark, DE: International Reading Association & NY: Teachers College Press.

Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (Eds.) (1997). Reading engagement: Motivating readers through integrated instruction. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hidi, S. (1990). Interest and its contribution as a mental resource for learning. Review of Educational Research, 60, 549-571.

Johnston, P. H. (1984). Assessment in reading. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, and P. Mosenthal (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume I (pp. 147-182). NY: Longman.

Johnston, P. (1997-98). Commentary on a critique. The Reading Teacher, 51, 282-285.

Johnston, P., & Allington, R. (1991). Remediation. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume II (pp. 984 - 1012). NY: Longman.

Johnston, P., & Winograd, P. (1985). Passive failure in reading. Journal of Reading Behavior, 17, 279-301.

Klenk, L., & Kibby, M. W. (2000). Re-mediating reading difficulties: Appraising the past, reconciling the present, constructing the future. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson & R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume III (pp. 269-284). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lipson, M. Y., & Wixson, K. K. (1997). The foundations of literacy. In M. Y. Lipson & K. K. Wixson, Assessment and instruction of reading and writing disability: An interactive approach (2nd ed.) (pp. 223-267). NY: Longman.

Lipson, M. Y., & Wixson, K. K. (1997). Formal assessment. In M. Y. Lipson & K. K. Wixson, Assessment and instruction of reading and writing disability: An interactive approach (2nd ed.) (pp. 379-434). NY: Longman.

McMaster, J. C. (1998). "Doing" literature: Using drama to build literacy. The Reading Teacher, 51, 574-584.

Miller, K. P., & Grant, R. A. (1995). From clinic to classroom: Becoming a reflective practitioner. Literacy: Issues & Practices, 12, 46-52.

Morrow, L. M. (1988). Retelling stories as a diagnostic tool. In S. M. Glazer, L. W. Searfoss, & L. M. Gentile (Eds.), Reexamining reading diagnosis: New trends and procedures (pp. 128-149). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

- Nagy, W. E., & Herman, P. A. (1987). Breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge: Implications for acquisition and instruction. In Beck, I., and McKeown, M., Vocabulary acquisition (pp. 19 -35).
- Nagy, W. E., & Scott, J. A. (2000). Vocabulary processes. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson & R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume III (pp. 269-284). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ovando, C. J., & Collier, V. P. (1985). ESL and bilingual classrooms (pp. 101-152). NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume II (pp. 609-640). NY: Longman.
- Pearson, P. D., & Valencia, S. (1987). Assessment, accountability, and professional prerogative. In J. Readence & S. Baldwin (Eds.), Research in literacy: Merging perspectives (pp. 3-16). Rochester, NH: National Reading Conference.
- Rasinski, T. V., & Hoffman, J. V. (2003). Oral reading in the school literacy curriculum. Reading Research Quarterly, 38, 510-522.
- Rupley, W. H., Logan, J. W., & Nichols, W. D. (1999). Vocabulary instruction in a balanced reading program. The Reading Teacher, 52, 336-346.
- Scarborough, H. S. (1998). Early identification of children at risk for reading disabilities: Phonological awareness and some other promising predictors. In B. K. Shapiro, P. J. Accardo & A. J. Capute (Eds.), Specific reading disability: A view of the spectrum. Timonium, MD: York Press.
- Schiefele, U. (1991). Interest, learning, and motivation. Educational Psychologist, 26, 299-323.
- Shepard, L. A. (1989). Why we need better assessments. Educational Leadership, 4-9.
- Shepard, L. A. (1993). Evaluating test validity. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Review of Research in Education: Volume 19 (pp. 405-450). Washington, DC: AERA.
- Schwartz, R. M. (1997). Self-monitoring in beginning reading. The Reading Teacher, 51, 40-48.
- Stahl, S. A., Duffy-Hester, A. M., & Stahl, K. A. (1998). Everything you wanted to know about phonics (but were afraid to ask). Reading Research Quarterly, 33, 338-355.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 21, 360-407.

Strecker, S. K., Roser, N. L., & Martinez, M. G. (1998). Toward understanding oral reading fluency. National Reading Conference Yearbook, 47, 295-310.

Taylor, C. (1994). Assessment for measurement or standards: The peril and promise of large-scale assessment reform. American Educational Research Journal, 31, 231-262.

Taylor, B. M., Hanson, B. E., Justice-Swanson, K., & Watts, S. M. (1997). Helping struggling readers: Linking small-group intervention with cross-age tutoring. The Reading Teacher, 51, 196-209.

Templeton, S., & Morris, D. (1999). Theory and research into practice: Questions teachers ask about spelling. Reading Research Quarterly, 34, 102-112.

Tobias, S. (1994). Interest, prior knowledge, and learning. Review of Educational Research, 64, 37-54.

Wigfield, A. (1997). Reading motivation: A domain-specific approach to motivation. Educational Psychologist, 32, 59-68.

Wigfield, A., & Karpathian, M. (1991). Who am I and what can I do? Children's self-concepts and motivation in achievement situations. Educational Psychologist, 26, 233-261.

Wixson, K. K. (1991). Diagnostic teaching. The Reading Teacher, 44, 420-422.

Wixson, K. K., & Lipson, M. Y. (1991). Perspectives on reading disability research. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume 2 (pp. 539-570). NY: Longman.

Wixson, K. K., Valencia, S. W., & Lipson, M. Y. (1994). Issues in literacy assessment: Facing the realities of internal and external assessment. Journal of Reading Behavior, 26, 315-337.

Wolf, M. (1997). A provisional, integrative account of phonological and naming-speed deficits in dyslexia: Implications for diagnosis and intervention. In B. A. Blachman (Ed.), Foundations of Reading Acquisition and Dyslexia. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.